

A comment on black hole state counting in loop quantum gravity

A. Ghosh and P. Mitra

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF Bidhannagar, Calcutta 700064

There are two ways of counting microscopic states of black holes in loop quantum gravity, one counting all allowed spin network labels j, m and the other involving only the labels m . Counting states with $|m| = j$, as done in a recent Letter, does not follow either.

Loop quantum gravity has yielded detailed counts of microscopic quantum states corresponding to a black hole. A start was made in [1] in the direction of quantizing a black hole characterized by an isolated horizon. The quantum states arise when the cross sections of the horizon are punctured by spin networks. The spin quantum numbers j, m , which characterize the punctures, can label the quantum states. The entropy is obtained by counting states that are consistent with a fixed area of the cross section [1] and a total spin projection constraint. An estimation of the entropy was carried out in [2] counting only m -labels (pure horizon states) – see also [3]. In [4], the j -labels were also recognized as characterizing states. Both approaches follow discussions in [1]. Unlike these *approximate estimations*, [5] has used exact numerical methods, counting j, m -labels as in [4]. Recently, [6] has also attempted exact calculations using some number theory. [6] presents two calculations, one of which counts j, m -labels, but the other counts only states having $|m| = j$, *in a bid to follow* [2]. Unfortunately, as explained below, this prescription is *not* in general equivalent to the rule of counting all horizon states or m -labels: it was reached only *approximately* for large black holes [2, 3]. Consequently this counting of states in [6] is invalid.

We use units such that $4\pi\gamma\ell_P^2 = 1$, where γ is the so-called Barbero-Immirzi parameter involved in the quantization and ℓ_P the Planck length. Setting the area A of the horizon equal to an eigenvalue of the area operator, we write

$$2 \sum_{j,m} s_{j,m} \sqrt{j(j+1)} = A, \quad (1)$$

where $s_{j,m}$ is the number of punctures carrying spin quantum numbers j, m and obeying the *spin projection constraint*

$$\sum_{j,m} m s_{j,m} = 0. \quad (2)$$

Consider for definiteness a small black hole with $A = 4\sqrt{6}$. This corresponds to 2 punctures each with $j = 2$. Each puncture in principle has 5 allowed values for m , but not all the 25 states obey (2), which is satisfied only if $m_2 = -m_1$, so that there are 5 states. These 5 states have different j, m -labels and therefore the number of states in the j, m -counting of [4] is 5. This is of course what the j, m calculation of [6] yields. But in fact the j -values of the two punctures being the same, the states have different m -labels, so that the number of states in the pure m -label counting envisaged in [1] is also 5. On the other hand, the number of states which the $|m| = j$ calculation of [6] gives is only 2, namely the states with $m_2 = -m_1 = \pm 2$.

Consider next the situation $A = 2\sqrt{2} + 2\sqrt{6}$. Here, there are 2 punctures with $j = 1, 2$. For (2) to be satisfied, m_2 cannot be larger than 1 in magnitude, so that there are only 3 combinations of m possible. As the j values may be interchanged, there are 6 states in the j, m counting prescription. However, the m counting prescription yields only 3 because the j values are not to be taken into consideration here. On the other hand, setting $|m| = j$, as in [6], leads to no state at all because ± 2 and ± 1 cannot cancel.

In short, in considering small black holes, or any black hole which can be treated exactly, the $|m| = j$ method of [6] may not count all states with distinct m -labels. It gives a severely reduced estimate except in special cases involving $j = \frac{1}{2}$ or for large area [2, 3]. In general, to get the correct number of horizon states (m counting), one has to use the formula $\frac{(\sum s_m)!}{\prod s_m!}$, where $s_m \equiv \sum_j s_{j,m}$, [3] for each allowed set $\{m\}$ and find the sum.

We thank Fernando Barbero for correspondence.

-
- [1] A. Ashtekar, J. Baez and K. Krasnov, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **4** (2000) 1
 - [2] K. A. Meissner, Class. Quant. Grav. **21** (2004) 5245
 - [3] A. Ghosh and P. Mitra, Phys. Rev. **D74** (2006) 064026
 - [4] A. Ghosh and P. Mitra, Phys. Letters **B616** (2005) 114

- [5] A. Corichi, J. Diaz-Polo, and E. Fernandez-Borja, Phys. Rev. Letters **98** (2007) 181301
- [6] I. Agullo, J. F. Barbero G., J. Diaz-Polo, E. Fernandez-Borja, E. J. S. Villaseñor, Phys. Rev. Letters, **100** (2008) 211301